



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,248	12/19/2001	Masanori Aritomi	35.C16075	7217
5514	7590	04/25/2006	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			PITARO, RYAN F	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			PAPER NUMBER	
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/021,248	ARITOMI, MASANORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F. Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26, have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 1/30/2006.
3. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 23, 24,25, are independent claims. In Amendment C, Claims 1-26 were amended, and Claims 27-36 were cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1,4,6,8,11,13,15,18,20,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Guzak et al. ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) in view of Yacoub ("Yacoub", US 6452692).
- 6.

As per claim 1, Guzak discloses an information processing apparatus (Column 3 lines 13-16) comprising: a storage device (Column 3 lines 13-16), for storing the peripheral objects for predetermined devices based on directory information; (Column 3 lines 43-49 & Figure 2) detection means (Column 3 lines 26-28 *wherein tree view control displays a view of items as per code instructions*) for detecting a specific object detected by said detection means; display means (Column 1 lines 59-61), for displaying, in accordance with a tree list (Column 2 lines 58-61); said specific object detected by said detection means; control means (Column 25-26 lines 26-30). Guzak fails to distinctly point out determining devices based on local object. However, Yacoub expressly teaches permitting said display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by said detection means (Column 14 lines 62-67), in a manner based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to said information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to said information processing apparatus (Column 9 lines 17-33, Column 11 lines 7-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Yacoub with the apparatus of Guzak. Motivation to do so would have been to relieve all of the burden from the user of finding an appropriate printer.

As per claims 4, Guzak-Yacoub teaches an information processing apparatus, wherein said control means performs the sorting for an object display, so that the specific object is displayed at a higher location on a list (Column 6 lines 16-24).

As per claim 6, Guzak-Yacoub teaches a tree structure in which a specific object is a printer device (Column 6 lines 16-24).

Claims 8,15 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 and 18 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13 and 20 are individually similar to scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, Guzak -Yacoub teaches a computer readable storage medium (Figure 1 item 16) for storing the control program.

7. Claims 2, 9,16, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) and Yacoub ("Yacoub", US 6452692), and further in view of Maarek et al ("Maarek", US# 5,895,474).

8.

As per claim 2, Guzak-Yacoub fails to disclose a control means where it omits an intermediate directory path leading to a specific object. However, Maarek teaches such a method providing an interactive, tree structured, graphical visualization aid wherein a control means for

omitting an intermediate path is applied (Column 6 lines 9-15 & Figures 4a-4c). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maarek 's teaching with the modified Guzak's apparatus to ease the visualization effort by reducing the clutter on the screen (Maarek, Column 6 lines 23-24).

Claims 9,16 are individually similar to scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 24 and 25 are individually similar in scope to claim 23, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 3,5,10,12,17,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) and Yacoub ("Yacoub", US 6452692) , and further in view of Mital et al ("Mital", US# 6,003,040).

As per claim 3, Guzak-Yacoub fails to disclose an information processing apparatus, wherein, before the specific object detected by said detection means is displayed on said display means in accordance with the tree list, said control means omits a directory path in which the specific object is not present. However, Mital teaches such an apparatus and method for storing

and navigating among data items in which the directory path is omitted if said specific object is not present (Column 23 lines 42-47 *a result of the query shows only the relevant results and hides the rest of the hierarchy*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mital's teaching with Guzak-Yacoub's apparatus so that the display of the knowledge can be achieved without significantly adding to or making more complex the minimized domain of user interface for the benefit of non-complexity.

As per claim 5, Guzak-Yacoub fails to disclose an information processing apparatus, wherein, when said specific object detected by said detection means is to be displayed on said display means in accordance with said tree list, and when said specific object can not be referred to directly due to access right limitations, said control means displays a higher object for which there are no access right problems. However, Mital teaches such an apparatus which displays according to access right limitations a higher object, which there are no access right problems (Column 24 lines 9-12 *where users can only see only some of the object instances and links within the system based on access rights*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mital's teaching with Guzak-Yacoub's apparatus so that the display of information would not include inaccessible objects; therefore, displaying the relevant objects at a higher position on the tree for the benefit of finding more relevant objects.

Claims 10 and 17 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12 and 19 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claims 7,14,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Guzak et al ("Guzak", US# 5,838,319) in view of Yacoub ("Yacoub", US 6452692).

11.

As per claim 7 Guzak-Yacoub fails to disclose an object for a compound device including a printer function. Official Notice is given that the use of a compound device including a printer function is notoriously well known in the art; examples of which are: printer/scanners, printer/fax, printer/copier, and any combination thereof. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the use of a compound device including a printer function with Guzak-Yacoub apparatus so that a multifunctional printer could be a specific object listed in the hierarchical tree for the benefit of functionality.

Claims 14 and 21 are individually similar to scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100